**Dr. Tundi Agardy**
**Talking Points of Presentation to the**
**California MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force**
**February 22, 2005 in Monterey, California**

I begin with the disclaimer that I am on outsider in this process and know very little of what has been happening in California regarding the Act and MPAs. Rather, my experience is almost exclusively with marine protected area planning and management outside the USA. From that experience I have developed some opinions that I would like to share with the Task Force; these are summarized in the four points below.

1. To maximize the potential of MPAs in conserving California's marine life and marine industries, I urge the Task Force to think broadly and take a functional approach, rather than focusing too much on the structure of these environments. Given the complexity of the ecosystems under consideration in the site selection process (seven major habitat types across several regions and depth gradients), it is best to interpret "representative" habitats at the grossest (largest scale) level – keeping it as simple as possible.

2. I would caution against interpreting what is meant by a "California network" too narrowly. Networks do not necessarily mean biological networks of no-take reserves, which seem to be the focus of a spate of recent discussions and scientific papers. In the context of the MLPA, I would interpret California networks to mean representative systems of MPAs to conserve the full range of California's natural marine heritage. Such a system could and should include biological networks of no-take areas within the targeted representative habitats – but should also include social/institutional networking that presents economies of scale and maximizes the effectiveness of MPAs. (I recognize that it would be futile to change the wording of the law to substitute network for system, but the way I read the Act I think the intent was to develop a state-wide system of networks that connect some but not all individual MPA sites by the underlying ecology and connect all sites through human/institutional networks.)

3. I am a big advocate for the use of multiple use MPAs that embed smaller no-take areas within a larger framework of management. Such MPAs, I believe, are more effective in addressing myriad cumulative threats to marine systems – and act to create better testing grounds for management and sites to further general scientific understanding of marine systems and our impacts on them. Reference sites are critically important in this regard, and should include not only no-take areas but no-go areas as well. Large multiple use areas could well incorporate or be complementary to freshwater and coastal (terrestrial) protected areas, which I believe would be an important step towards true ecosystem-based management needed to preserve ecological integrity of marine areas (recognizing that many

impacts on the marine environment come from land and freshwater use). Multiple use MPAs that are planned in a bottom-up way to address real threats and target commonly held goals and objectives can better help resolve user conflicts and build support for MPA designations over the long term. Though some user groups salivate at the utterance of multiple use MPAs (thinking they are less strictly protected and perhaps closer to paper parks than other designations) multiple use MPAs can be rigorously designed and provide strong protections for the environment, as has occurred in many MPAs around the world.

4. The goal of the MLPA is not just to create a network or system but to create an effective network or system. Science (here I mean natural science, not social science) is integral but science and scientists should not drive the whole process unilaterally. Having said that, I believe that natural resource management or environmental policy that ignores science or uses science selectively is bad policy, so science does have a crucial role to play. Scientific information must underlie the recognition that there is a problem with current marine management practices, and determine the exact nature of the problem. Science can and should be used to select priority sites for MPA designations – providing the rationale for the "where" but not providing the exclusive rationale for the "how". Science must be better harnessed to understand true threats to the marine environment, be they from direct impacts of commercial or recreational fishing or indirect impacts such as those arising from land-based sources of pollution and freshwater diversion. Threats to particular sites that can be addressed by MPAs should help determine the size, shape, and management regimes of MPAs – for this reason, a cookie-cutter approach to MPA design and management is ineffective. Finally, science can and should be used to help determine how MPAs can complement other management measures, and vice versa, as well as informing the process of designing monitoring and evaluation methods to be sure that management objectives should be met. What science should not do is unilaterally drive the goal-setting process – this is a societal matter, to be taken up by all special interests, including scientists and environmentalists.

Thank you.